

NOMENCLATORIAL NOTES ON
TWO SOUTHEASTERN RHYNCHOSIAS

ROBERT L. WILBUR¹

In 1834 Nuttall described what he considered to be a new genus of legumes from Florida naming its only species *Pitcheria galactoides*. Almost all authors since, including Bentham (Gen. Pl. 1: 543. 1865) and Taubert (in Engler and Prantl's Nat. Pfl. III. 3: 373. 1894), have treated it as a species of *Rhynchosia*. Burkart (Darwiniana 11: 268, 269. 1957) also concluded that it did not merit generic rank and that it had close affinities with species in the Antilles and South America. He noted that the name most commonly employed under *Rhynchosia* was illegitimate, being a later homonym of *R. galactoides* (H.B.K.) DC. This later homonym is, of course, illegitimate even though the prior species with the earlier name has long been considered a member of the genus *Calopogonium*. Burkart therefore provided a new name, *R. pitcheria*.

However, Bertoloni in an often overlooked paper named this species *Lespedeza cytisoides* more than one hundred years earlier. In spite of Bertoloni's unfortunate decision as to the generic placement of this as well as many other species described by him from the Southeast, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the species as it was fully described and accompanied by a full-page plate. Asa Gray in his review (Am. Jour. Sci. II. 14: 114-115. 1852) of Bertoloni's contribution unhesitatingly assigned the name to the synonymy of *Pitcheria galactoides*. Therefore the following new combination is required for this Gulf Coast endemic:

***Rhynchosia cytisoides* (Bert.) comb. nov.**

Pitcheria galactoides Nutt., Jour. Acad. Phil. I. 7: 94. 1834.

Rhynchosia galactoides (Nutt.) Endl. ex Walp., Repert. Bot. System. 1: 790. 1842 but not *R. galactoides* (H.B.K.) DC., Prodr. 2: 387. 1825.

Lespedeza cytisoides Bert., Mem. Acad. Sci. Bologna 2: 278. 1850.

Rhynchosia pitcheria Burkart, Darwiniana 11: 268. 1957.

¹Grateful acknowledgment is made to the National Science Foundation for a grant of research funds to Duke University (NSF-Grant 5636) which made the present study possible.

The binomials most recently employed for the erect, unifoliolate *Rhynchosia* of the southeastern Coastal Plain have been either *R. simplicifolia* (Walt.) Wood or *R. reniformis* (Pursh) DC. Since neither of these names is fully in accord with the current International Code, a brief discussion seems desirable.

The most widely used name, *R. simplicifolia* (Walt.) Wood, is a later homonym of *R. simplicifolia* (H.B.K.) DC., and hence is not legitimate (Art. 64.2).

Recently Turner (The Legumes of Texas, p. 255. 1959) has taken up *R. reniformis* (Pursh) DC. for this species. However Pursh published this as *Glycine reniformis* with *Trifolium simplicifolium* Walt. listed in synonymy. There was no presently acceptable reason why Pursh should not then have taken up Walter's epithet as *Glycine simplicifolia* H.B.K. was not published until 1823 or nine years after Pursh's publication. Hence *G. reniformis* Pursh is an illegitimate name as it was superfluous when published (Art. 64.1).

The desirability of Article 64.1 has been recently challenged by both Furtado (Taxon 9: 147-150. 1960) and Holtum (Taxon 10: 33-34. 1961). Furtado's long campaign against this portion of the Code has now entered its third decade having been rejected most recently by the Montreal Botanical Congress. Holtum argues that "a number of well-known and long used names, which under Art. 64.1 have been regarded as unusable, could be used" if this portion of the Code were eliminated and botanists relied instead upon typification and priority to rule unaided. This is no doubt true but it is certain also that the elimination of this provision would change the names of a very large number of plants to which botanists have become accustomed in the more than thirty years that the present provision has been in effect. As Fosberg points out (Taxon 8: 65. 1959) Art. 64.1 is indeed "a two-edged sword." Without wishing to debate the original merits of our Art. 64.1, I believe it now would serve stability better to retain the primary strictures of this provision.

Fortunately however, for the sake of at least some stabili-

ty, Article 72 permits the retention of one of the binomials by which this unifoliolate *Rhynchosia* has been known in the past. There was no epithet available in 1825 that could have been transferred by DeCandolle into *Rhynchosia* but the binomial *R. reniformis* then published by him need be no more considered as a new combination than are *Desmodium rotundifolium* or *D. lineatum*. All three of these names were first published by DeCandolle who cited as synonyms names which were later homonyms. All are or should be credited solely to DeCandolle with no parenthetical authority. The synonymy of the species is listed below.

***Rhynchosia reniformis* DC.**

Trifolium simplicifolium Walt., Fl. Car. 184. 1788.

Glycine tomentosa var. ϕ *monophylla* Michx., Fl. Bor. Am. 2: 63. 1803.

Glycine reniformis Pursh, Fl. Am. Sept. 486. 1814. *nom. illegit.* (Art. 64.1)

Arcyphyllum simplicifolium (Walt.) Ell., Jour. Acad. Phil. I. 1: 371. 1818.

Glycine monophylla (Michx.) Nutt., Gen. N. Am. Pl. 2: 115. 1818, not Linnaeus, Mant. 1: 101. 1767.

Glycine simplicifolia (Walt.) Ell., Sk. Bot. S. C. & Ga. 2: 234. 1823, not *G. simplicifolia* H.B.K., Nov. Gen. et Sp. 6: 419. 1823.

Rhynchosia reniformis DC., Prodr. 2: 384. 1825.

Rhynchosia tomentosa var. *monophylla* (Michx.) T. & G., Fl. N. Am. 1: 284. 1838.

Phaseolus reniformis (Pursh) Eaton & Wright, N. Am. Bot. 353. 1840.

Psoralea alnifolia Bert., Mem. Acad. Sci. Bologna 2: 274. 1850.

Rhynchosia simplicifolia (Walt.) Wood, Class-Book 321. 1861, not DC., Prodr. 2: 389. 1825.

Dolicholus simplicifolius (Walt.) Vail, Bull. Torrey Club 26: 114. 1899. — DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY, DUKE UNIVERSITY.